EXHIBIT 300   **UII 024-000006117**

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary
Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview & Summary Information

Date Investment First Submitted: 2009-06-30
Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-08-21
Investment Auto Submission Date: 2012-02-29
Date of Last Investment Detail Update: 2012-02-24
Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update: 2012-08-21
Date of Last Revision: 2012-08-21

Agency: 024 - Department of Homeland Security   **Bureau:** 60 - United States Coast Guard

Investment Part Code: 01

Investment Category: 00 - Agency Investments

1. Name of this Investment: USCG - Interagency Operations Centers (IOC)

2. Unique Investment Identifier (UII): 024-000006117

Section B: Investment Detail

1. **Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

   As stated in the Maritime Port Operations Handbook (Jan. 2009), the objectives of IOCs are to: a) Maintain a common situational awareness picture of the maritime domain. b) Provide enhanced information sharing between port partners. c) Foster planning and coordination efforts with local DHS and other Federal, State, and local partners on a regular schedule through designated points of contact. d) Coordinate local asset operations to improve mission performance, eliminate redundancy in mission execution and avoid mission conflicts. e) Conduct risk assessment and analysis, resulting in risk management of operations. IOC is the vehicle for acquiring the information systems, facilities, and sensor networks necessary to deliver three new capabilities that form the IOC Process which facilitates the coordination of all IOC missions: Integrated Vessel Targeting (IVT); Interagency Operational Planning (IOP); and Operations Monitoring (OM).""Segment 1 will field an IOC information system, currently titled WatchKeeper, as a technology demonstrator with incremental fielding of capabilities to locations prioritized by the Sponsor. Evaluation of the pilot effort will occur prior to internal CG approval for full operational implementation. ""Beneficiaries include IOC Member Agencies including port partners and the general public who will benefit from overall increased situational awareness and enhanced maritime domain safety.""The IOC Information Management system (WatchKeeper) is dependent on the following systems:"* Tactical Track Data from NAIS"* NOAs & Person Information from MAGNet"* Ship Arrival

EXHIBIT 300   **UII 024-000006117**

Notification data from SANS"* Vessel Characteristics from MISLE"* Strategic Track Data from CWSS"* Vessel Information from LRIT"* Spatial data layers from E-GIS"* Mission and Asset Scheduling data from MASI"* Mission and Asset Data from ALMIS".

2. **How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.**

 The MNS, approved in 2005 and revalidated in FEB09, defined fifteen specific capability gaps. Overall, these gaps illustrate a lack of: a) basic awareness of vessel activities near vulnerable port and coastal infrastructure. b) Systems linking the ever-increasing volume of information with vessels in ways that help decision makers determine threat and develop the correct course of action. c) Infrastructure for effective information sharing and joint operations with port partners.   IOC is designed to enhance unity of effort among maritime stakeholders: * IVT: Integrates targeting results of agency-specific screening processes and builds a consolidated threat picture of people, vessels and cargo operating within IOC OPAREA as provided by intelligence and law enforcement communities in support of the Ports, Waterways and Coastal Security mission. This includes: * AIS Services * Data Services * Interagency Operations Planning: Integrates federal, state, and local asset status and schedules. Mission Requests are created from IVT results, along with other mission demand sources, such as regattas, patrols, and escort missions. These Mission Requests are prioritized by IOC decision makers, who assign assets to missions and form the IOC Daily schedule. * Operations Monitoring: Manages the IOC Daily Schedule against all emergent events - search and rescue, spills, and other events occurring outside the operational planning window. Creates and shares the tactical picture, including command and control, mission status, and status of IOC forces/Blue Force Tracks.   These capabilities support the interagency operations process described in the DHS IOC CONOPS and reflect the best practices outlined in the DHS Maritime Port Operations Handbook.   WatchKeeper will take advantage of existing enterprise IT components, evolving products, initiatives, COTS, and pilot projects with demonstrated capabilities. The products chosen support three core areas of the architecture: Information Presentation & Interface Layer; Information Discovery and Understanding Layer; Information Sharing, Processing and Consolidation Layer.   Because IOC is not fully funded, the program is not able to develop existing or new sensor integration. Existing radar overlays and video monitoring, for example, will not be integrated resulting in reduced situational awareness and reduced information sharing for USCG and port partners.

3. **Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.**

 Accomplishments for FY2011 include: a) Release of WatchKeeper software as a Technology Demonstrator to key target sites : Detroit, San Diego, Puget Sound, New York, Long Island Sound, Boston, Miami, Key West, and Guam. b) Completion of a WatchKeeper Operational Assessment/Analysis. c) The Integrated Logistics Support Plan (ILSP) v1.0 approved 11/16/2010 d) An independent Logistics Assessment completed 2/08/2011 e) Signed ORD and ABP were submitted to DHS for review   In addition, IOC successfully completed the following DHS Investment Reviews: a) Project Level ARB review (11/2010) b) Project Level ADM Review (12/2010) c) Segment 2 ADE 2B (03/2011) d) Segment 2 System Definition Review (SDR) (02/2011) e) Segment 2 Preliminary Design Review (PDR) (04/2011)

EXHIBIT 300   **UII 024-000006117**

The following Segment 2 test activities have been completed: a) TMOT Chartered b) TEMP v2.0 at DHS for approval c) DT&E Plan drafted d) Operational Test Authority (COMOPTEVFOR) in place.

4. **Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).**

The WatchKeeper Technology Demonstrator will be deployed to the following sites: San Juan, New Orleans, San Francisco, Honolulu, Ohio Valley, LA/LB. This will result in deployment to 17 sites by 3QFY2012. Deployment to an additional 18 sites is planned to be completed by 4QFY2014.   Additional FY2012 planned activities include: * Completion of Watchkeeper deployment to Phase 1 sites * Start or commencement of Watchkeeper deployment to Phase 2 sites * Transition to a mixed lifecycle investment * Begin development of final software build * Seek approval for downgrade to D-102-01 Non-Major status   FY2012 Deployments include: * San Juan * New Orleans & Morgan City * San Francisco * Honolulu * Ohio Valley & Pittsburgh * LA/LB * Tampa - St. Petersburg * Delaware Bay * Baltimore * North Carolina & Wilmington * Columbia River (Portland)   FY2013 planned activities include: * Watchkeeper technology demonstrator plus final software build FY2013 planned Deployments (subject to change) include: * Houston-Galveston & Port Arthur * Corpus Christi * Mobile * Buffalo * Lake Michigan * Sault Ste Marie & Duluth * Northern New England.

5. **Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.**

2009-02-11

EXHIBIT 300   **UII 024-000006117**

Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding				
	PY-1 & Prior	**PY 2011**	**CY 2012**	**BY 2013**
Planning Costs:	$25.5	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	$45.5	$0.0	$3.0	$0.0
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	$71.0	0	$3.0	0
O & M Costs:	$0.0	$0.0	$3.4	$4.6
O & M Govt. FTEs:	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	0	0	$3.4	$4.6
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	$71.0	0	$6.4	$4.6
Total Govt. FTE costs:	0	0	0	0
# of FTE rep by costs:	0	0	0	0

Total change from prior year final President's Budget ($)		$0.0	$0.0	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		0.00%	0.00%	

EXHIBIT 300   **UII 024-000006117**

2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:

The summary of funding table Planning and Acquisition total costs of $74M has not changed from the FY2012 Exhibit 300 submission. Steady State costs have been changed to reflect the costs required to operate and maintain the deployed solution and are based on LCCE and Acquisition Plan refinements.

EXHIBIT 300   **UII 024-000006117**

Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value ($M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
Awarded	7008	HSCG2310F2CD015	GS10F0432P	4730							
Awarded	7008	HSCG2310FT00002	GS35F0288M	4730							
Awarded	7008	HSCG4411JP00003	HSCG4410DPCZ101	7008							
Awarded	7008	HSCG4411JT00005	HSCG4410DPCZ100	7008							

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

All current & planned IOC contracts will be in full compliance with USCG standard operating procedures, the HSAR, and the FAR. It is the intent that all contracts, where required, will include the requisite EVM clauses and the government will review EVM data on at least a monthly basis. EVM will be performed and reported in compliance with ANSI guidance using a variety of tools, policies, and procedures. These data will be mapped against specific performance measures and requirements and included in the quarterly DHS periodic reporting and USCG quarterly PMA reporting. Performance measures will also shared within USCG and across DHS and DoD so that lessons learned across the organizational investments are leveraged. Once systems are deployed, operational analysis including contract reviews in the context of the performance goals is performed for the IOC investment in conformance with OMB and DHS Operational Analysis Guidance. O&M contracts may include EVM clauses; use of EVM will be determined closer to O&M contract initiation. For those contracts that do not require EVM because they are either FFP or are below USCG established EVM reporting thresholds, the IOC project team reviews monthly status reports to verify that work accomplished is consistent work reported in the status report. Regardless of contract type, size or duration, the CG IOC PM meets regularly with the contractual PMs to verify that work is being met within contractually established cost, schedule, and performance metrics. In addition to external contractors, IOC leverages other 'in house' offices such as C3CEN, OSC, etc. to provide services to the IOC project. These intra-agency agreement Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) include specific cost, schedule, and performance metrics similar to IOC contracts with external entities. The IOC PM meets regularly with the USCG assigned PMs to verify that metrics are being met. In both instances (external contractors and intra-agency entities) if metrics are not being met, remediation plans are formulated and implemented. Regular reviews of the IOC risk matrix assists to identify potential issues before they occur and implement remediation plans in a proactive manner.

EXHIBIT 300   **UII 024-000006117**

EXHIBIT 300   **UII 024-000006117**

Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

Section A: General Information

Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-08-21

Section B: Project Execution Data

Table II.B.1 Projects

Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost ($M)
1	Segment 1	WatchKeeper Information Management.			
2	Segment 2	WatchKeeper Information Management.			

Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities ($M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance ($M)	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost ($M)	Count of Activities
1	Segment 1							
2	Segment 2							

Key Deliverables

Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days)	Schedule Variance (%)
				NONE				

EXHIBIT 300   **UII 024-000006117**

Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics								
Metric Description	**Unit of Measure**	**FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping**	**Measurement Condition**	**Baseline**	**Target for PY**	**Actual for PY**	**Target for CY**	**Reporting Frequency**
Mean Time Between Failures (average across WatchKeeper Components reporting failures)	Hours	Technology - Reliability and Availability	Over target	720.000000	720.000000	326.000000	720.000000	Monthly
Mean Time to Repair (average across WatchKeeper Components reporting failures)	Hours	Technology - Reliability and Availability	Under target	24.000000	24.000000	1.200000	24.000000	Monthly
% System Availability (also called Operational Availability)	Percent	Technology - Reliability and Availability	Over target	99.000000	99.000000	99.500000	99.000000	Monthly
% Helpdesk tickets that are open	Percent	Customer Results - Customer Benefit	Under target	10.000000	10.000000	22.000000	10.000000	Monthly
# of Functional Requirements met in the WatchKeeper Information management system	Number	Technology - Effectiveness	Over target	363.000000	108.000000	110.000000	363.000000	Quarterly
# helpdesk tickets resolved	Number	Customer Results - Customer Benefit	Over target	192.000000	0.000000	0.000000	768.000000	Quarterly
# Users trained	Number	Customer Results - Customer Benefit	Over target	635.000000	0.000000	0.000000	975.000000	Quarterly
# Sectors WatchKeeper Deployed	Number	Customer Results - Service Coverage	Over target	15.000000	0.000000	0.000000	20.000000	Quarterly